

REMARKS

STATEMENT CONCERNING COMMON OWNERSHIP

Application No. 10/815,792 and U.S. Patent No. 7,002,302 were, at the time the invention of Application No. 10/815,792 was made, owned by Samsung SDI Co., Ltd.

Under MPEP § 706.02(l)(2), this statement constitutes sufficient evidence to establish common ownership at the time the invention was made.

Applicants note that this statement concerning common ownership was included on page 10 of the Reply filed June 20, 2006, but not acknowledged by the examiner in this Office Action.

Claims

The claims have not been amended. Claims 2 and 11-20 were previously withdrawn from further consideration. Accordingly, claims 1 and 3-10 are currently pending in the application, of which claim 1 is an independent claim.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,204,659 issued to Sarma ("Sarma"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) to be proper, a single reference must disclose every claimed feature. To be patentable, a claim need only recite a single novel

feature that is not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, the failure of a cited reference to disclose one or more claimed features renders the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection improper.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 1 must be withdrawn because Sarma fails to disclose every claimed feature in claim 1. Specifically, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

... each of unit pixels including a transistor with source/drain regions,
wherein transistors of at least two unit pixels of the R, G and B unit pixels have drain *regions* of different geometric structures (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that Sarma fails to teach or suggest such features. The Office Action concludes that Sarma's drain elements 734, 744, 754, and 764 teach the drain regions of claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree. Sarma's drain elements 734, 744, 754, and 764 are drain electrodes, not drain regions. A person of ordinary skill in the art would readily understand the difference between a drain region and a drain electrode. For example, referring to Applicants' paragraph [0039] and Figure 2A, it is clear that a semiconductor layer 210 includes source/drain regions 221, 225, and these regions are electrically connected to source/drain electrodes 251, 255 through contacts 241, 245, respectively. Thus, Sarma's drain elements can not be fairly relied upon to teach the drain regions of claim 1.

Furthermore, although Sarma discloses different-sized semiconductor islands 731, 741, 751, and 761, as well as different-sized drain elements (i.e. drain electrodes) 734, 744, 754, and 764, Sarma is silent with regard to the structure of the drain regions in the semiconductor islands 731, 741, 751, and 761. Hence, Sarma fails to teach or suggest at least "wherein transistors of at least two unit pixels of the R, G and B unit pixels have drain regions of different geometric structures."

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 3, and 5. Claims 3 and 5 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least for this reason. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features

of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Sarma in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,002,302 issued to Park ("Park"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 is allowable at least because it depends from an allowable base claim. Furthermore, in view of the **Statement Concerning Common Ownership** on page 7 of this reply, Park is disqualified as prior art per 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), and claim 4 is allowable over Sarma.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 4.

Claims 6-8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Sarma in view of Japanese Publication No. 2001-109399 applied for by Yamada ("Yamada"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6-8 and 10 are allowable over Sarma and Yamada fails to cure the deficiencies of Sarma noted above with regard to claim 1. Hence, claims 6-8 and 10 are allowable at least because they depend from an allowable claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 6-8 and 10.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Sarma in view of Yamada in further view of Park. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 is allowable at least because it depends from an allowable base claim. Furthermore, in view of the **Statement Concerning Common Ownership** on page 7 of this reply, Park is disqualified as prior art per 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), and claim 9 is allowable over Sarma and Yamada.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 9.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: December 12, 2006

H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP/RTS/alj